

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants respectfully note that claims 41 and 42 have not been addressed or rejected and as such, if the claims are not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request a non-final action addressing these claims, if necessary. However, based on the differences between the claims and the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of July 21, 2005. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 23 would be allowable if written in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are allowable over the cited references based on the telephone conference and as further set forth below.

Claims 1-2, 14-22 and 24-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duluk, Jr. et al. in view of Lentz et al. As a preliminary matter, the Examiner noted in the "Response to Amendments/Arguments" section that in the Examiner's view, Applicants were arguing features not recited in the rejected claims. During the telephone conference, the Examiner indicated that if the points argued were better expressed in the claims, that the claims would be in condition for allowance. Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 14, 27, 28 and 41 to note that, among other things, in addition to the other novel operations and structures in the claims, the independent claims include generating coordinate data representing an initial rasterization starting point estimate that is a starting point estimate that is within the current tile (see e.g. Specification, FIGs. 6-13). In addition to failing to disclose the other aspects of the independent claims, the cited references fail to also describe alone or in combination, the initial rasterization starting point estimate that is within the current tile being rendered and discarding the sorted vertex data of

primitives that lie outside the boundary of the current tile being rendered. For example, Duluk explicitly describes a starting point that lies outside rather than within the tile (Duluk at column 76, lines 34-36, 45-46, 50-51; FIG. 45). Further, Lentz explicitly teaches starting the rasterization of a triangle at a point outside the triangle (as also does Duluk), as illustrated by the "X" shown in FIG. 9. Since Lentz rasterizes points outside the tile boundary, Lentz does not discard the sorted vertex data that lie outside of the tile boundary. Therefore, Lentz fails to make up for the shortcomings of Duluk. Moreover, as best understood, the combination of Duluk and Lentz would teach preserving rather than discarding a starting point outside of the tile boundary (as taught in Duluk), while traversing the bounding box left to right as taught in Lentz.

As to claim 28, the claim is also allowable for the reasons noted above and further since the claim requires, among other things, "determining whether the sorted primitives are positioned within a current tile to be transmitted to a rasterizer" since, for example, Duluk and Lentz show that the starting point lies outside of the tile boundary, rather than as claimed. For these reasons also the claim is believed to be in condition for allowance.


The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Dated: 7/20/05

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 609-7599
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414